



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ilar questions, and consent is given, the court has always exercised great liberality in permitting this to be done. And doubtless it is within our discretion to allow it in any case when justified by the circumstances. *Green v. Biddle*, 8 Wheat. 17, 5 L. ed. 551; *Florida v. Georgia*, 17 How. 491, 15 L. ed. 188; *The Gray Jacket*, 5 Wall. 370, 18 L. ed. 646. It does not appear that applicant is interested in any other case which will be affected by the decision of this case; as the parties are represented by competent counsel, the need of assistance cannot be assumed and consent has not been given."

EMINENT DOMAIN—EVIDENCE OF VALUE—OFFERS TO PURCHASE—RECORD ON APPEAL—DAMAGES TO ADJACENT PROPERTY—INSTRUCTIONS.—1. The testimony of an owner of real property of offers to purchase the same for hotel, residential, or amusement purposes, or for a ferry, or a railroad terminal, or to lease the property for hotel purposes, is inadmissible on the issue in condemnation proceedings as to the value of such property.

2. Statements by the court in his charge which refer to evidence which does not appear in a bill of exceptions not purporting to contain all the evidence, when not excepted to nor corrected by counsel, will be taken as supplementing the evidence in the record.

3. Just compensation to the owner of three absolutely separate and independent, though adjoining, farms, one of which only was taken in condemnation proceedings, does not demand an award of the damages to the two remaining farms, arising from the proposed use of the condemned property for military purposes.

4. The jury on a trial *de novo* upon an appeal from an award of commissioners in condemnation proceedings are properly instructed that they must be satisfied as to the value and damage by the testimony produced before them, without reference to any testimony produced before the commissioners, and that they must not be influenced by the commissioners' report. *Sharp v. U. S.*, 24 Sup. Ct. 114.

BANKRUPTCY—PREFERENCE—UNRECORDED CHATTEL MORTGAGES—AVOIDANCE—DATE OF TRANSFER.—Bankr. Act, sec. 3a, Act July 1, 1898, c. 541, 30 Stat. 546 (U. S. Comp. St. 1901, p. 3422), declares a transfer of property while insolvent, with intent to prefer creditors, an act of bankruptcy, and, for filing a petition based on such an act, allows four months from the date of recording the instrument, or from the date of notorious exclusive possession by the beneficiary. Section 60a, 30 Stat. 562 (U. S. Comp. St. 1901, p. 3445), makes such a transfer as above enumerated a preference, and, if given within four months before the filing of the petition, the beneficiary having reason to believe that a preference was intended, declares it voidable by the trustee. *Held* that, in case of a preference by way of an unrecorded chattel mortgage, the transfer dates from the acquisition of possession under the mortgage. *Tatman v. Humphrey* (Mass.) 68 N. E. 844. Citing *Wilson v. Nelson*, 183 U. S. 191.

Per Knowlton, C. J.:

"In *Matthews v. Hardt*, 79 App. Div. 570, 9 Am. Bankr. R. 373, 80 N. Y.